

Page 1

1 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
2 YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC COMMENTS  
12  
13 Caliente Rail Corridor Environmental Impact  
Statement (EIS)  
14 Public Scoping Meeting  
15 Wednesday, May 5, 2004  
4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.  
16  
17 Caliente Youth Center  
U.S. Highway 93  
Caliente, Nevada  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 Reported by: Jane V. Michaels, RPR  
NV CCR No. 601  
25 CA CSR No. 10660

Page 2

1 MR. MOORE: My name is Ashley Moore, and I  
2 am a councilman for the City of Caliente. Before  
3 being on the City Council, which I have been in office  
4 for the past three years, I was in favor of  
5 transportation of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain. I  
6 am still in favor of this today. I also work here at  
7 the Caliente Youth Center, and I'd like to begin by  
8 thanking you for holding this important meeting here.  
9 My comments will be brief and to the point.  
10 As an elected official, I appreciated the  
11 recent record of decision by the Department because  
12 now we can move along as a city council to prepare to  
13 protect the health and safety of our residents and  
14 also look to maximize any economic benefit that may  
15 come out of the Caliente Corridor.  
16 I would like to see the railroad be  
17 designated as shared use and multiple use. I would  
18 also like to make sure the Department works with the  
19 City and ranchers along the route to make sure that  
20 the exact rail alignment location is negotiated with  
21 them so the rail line provides the maximum economic  
22 value and least risk.  
23 We have a fire chief that does a great job  
24 for us, but he and his volunteers will need the  
25 top-of-the-class emergency response training and

Page 3

1 equipment to be able to respond to any incident. I  
2 urge, and I mean strongly urge, DOE to locate safe  
3 support facilities, such as the fleet maintenance  
4 facility off-site in rural communities, such as right  
5 here in Caliente.  
6 I would like DOE to develop and implement a  
7 job training and labor participation program aimed at  
8 maximizing employment of county residents at the  
9 intermodal transfer casks, maintenance, and other  
10 facilities located in Lincoln County.  
11 I would like to see DOE be required to  
12 purchase electrical energy to operate and maintain the  
13 intermodal transfer and other facilities from Lincoln  
14 County Power District.  
15 I understand why you come to your decision,  
16 and keeping the waste out of the populated areas of  
17 the state makes sense. But please don't forget rural  
18 Nevada. If we're going to bear the burden of this  
19 national transportation campaign, then I think our  
20 impacts should be mitigated.  
21 Again, thank you for coming to Caliente to  
22 get the comments from the residents that would be most  
23 impacted by this international impact program. Any  
24 job worth doing is worth doing right.  
25 MR. KASOLD: My name is Herb Kasold. I'm a

Page 4

1 retired military graduate of the Army CBR school for  
2 the sale of nuclear weapons employment. So I have  
3 some background in radiation and all the other massive  
4 weapons.  
5 I have toured the Yucca Mountain site. I  
6 have toured the nuclear plant in Red Wing, Minnesota.  
7 I'm very much for this whole program. I have no  
8 interest in -- I'm not on any committee. I don't work  
9 for any of the organizations. But I went through  
10 these facilities with a real critical eye. And they  
11 have gone the extra mile to do everything they can to  
12 safeguard it. And I'm concerned that we're wasting  
13 unbelievable taxpayer money studying and  
14 cross-studying this whole thing. This is ridiculous.  
15 We need somebody to make a final decision and charge  
16 ahead on this thing.  
17 My concern a little bit is the alternate  
18 routes to get this rail line going. I think it should  
19 come down through Caliente although I live much  
20 further north. I have no interest in Caliente other  
21 than visiting occasionally.  
22 The spur line should go through -- come to  
23 Caliente because they have an infrastructure there,  
24 they have services available, and they have flat  
25 ground where you can build your transfer facilities

Page 5

1 and so forth. It's a much more suitable site than  
 2 trying to come over that crestline.  
 3 So I would recommend that they do consider  
 4 the Caliente spur off of the main railroad line  
 5 because, for one thing, it will sure boost that town  
 6 jobwise, and they can provide the facilities that they  
 7 need for the transfer station.  
 8 Here's an observation. Civilians cannot  
 9 make a decision. This is from a retired military guy  
 10 who found this out after retiring from the military.  
 11 Put the military in charge, and we'll get it done. I  
 12 hope you send this to some congressmen.  
 13 MS. WRIGHT: My name is Sherry Kaiser  
 14 Wright, and I'm for it. I think because it's been in  
 15 Nevada since the '50s. Maybe longer. I think that  
 16 the State should be getting things for the people to  
 17 put up with the stuff that's going through here, you  
 18 know, the benefits.  
 19 That's about all I can think of. But I'm  
 20 for it. And I know that some people are very against  
 21 it, but I can't see why. I think because Lincoln  
 22 County is the poorest county in Nevada. It will give  
 23 a lot of jobs maybe or more independence so the kids  
 24 could stay home instead of leaving to go to work.  
 25 Thank you.

Page 6

1 MS. DAVIS: My name is Amelia Davis. I'm  
 2 not for it. I am definitely against it. I think  
 3 we've had all we need. We started with the first  
 4 bomb. We've had the whole bit. I think somebody else  
 5 should share it for a while. I just don't think we  
 6 need it here. That's how I feel on it. I think  
 7 that's all you need to know.  
 8 MR. ROWE: My name is George T. Rowe. I'm  
 9 a County Commissioner for Lincoln County. People call  
 10 me Tommy. We've been going to all these DOE meetings  
 11 to keep informed and stuff. And DOE keeps telling us  
 12 to work with them to keep informed. And I'm here to  
 13 represent all the people of Lincoln County. And DOE  
 14 is not listening to what we're telling them.  
 15 I've got a lot of ranchers that have  
 16 grazing rights on this Caliente corridor. And just as  
 17 recent as last Saturday, I've talked to some of the  
 18 ranchers, and they said that DOE was supposed to have  
 19 contacted them about going through their range.  
 20 In fact, one of the ranchers said he took  
 21 an Oriental guy that was working the range out that  
 22 way, working the corridor for the railroad  
 23 right-of-way -- he said that he took him up and showed  
 24 him a better route to go through their ranges where it  
 25 would help the range people. It wouldn't affect the

Page 7

1 cows. It wouldn't affect any of the range.  
 2 And this is on multiple ranches in the  
 3 area. It was a better route. It was a lot easier to  
 4 work for the railroad. And it was, in fact, even a  
 5 little shorter. But nobody's ever contacted them.  
 6 The rancher told me if DOE would contact them and let  
 7 them evaluate this other route, it's not near as  
 8 steep, better ground for building railroad tracks in.  
 9 They said that they didn't think they'd  
 10 have any problems at all with the ranchers in Lincoln  
 11 County if DOE would contact them and work with them.  
 12 But as of yet, they haven't been contacted. And  
 13 that's my big concern. They're not working with the  
 14 people. They're working with the commissioners and  
 15 the mayor of Caliente and stuff like that.  
 16 But they've got to go out and do some  
 17 legwork and work with these other and better -- the N4  
 18 Grazing Board. They answered a letter that the  
 19 Grazing Board gave them, but they didn't answer the  
 20 questions. They just answered the letter.  
 21 And I do have a serious concern about the  
 22 boom-bust effect after the construction period's  
 23 over. What's going to happen if we're going to have  
 24 to build our schools up with new facilities and hire  
 25 new teachers and everything during the construction

Page 8

1 period, and after the construction period it goes  
 2 down. We're left holding the bag. Empty schools.  
 3 Teachers to lay off. That's one of my concerns.  
 4 Another one of my concerns is if they work  
 5 with the ranchers and spend two or three days in the  
 6 field with these ranchers, they could work out an  
 7 agreement with these guys that would be beneficial to  
 8 all. They would welcome them probably to go through  
 9 the range. They could show them where it wouldn't  
 10 affect anybody. But they're not doing it.  
 11 Another one of my concerns is that the  
 12 State, if you listen to the newspaper, seems to be  
 13 going towards the DOE now. They're sort of getting  
 14 more permissive all the time. Especially the  
 15 Republican party this last convention. I'm afraid  
 16 that in the tenth hour the State's going to say, Okay,  
 17 we're not going to have any restraints. We're going  
 18 to drop the lawsuits against you. You come through  
 19 with the railroad. Put the stuff in Yucca Mountain.  
 20 And you give the State this many dollars annually to  
 21 use Yucca Mountain. And the State will control all  
 22 the funds. And the affected units of government like  
 23 Lincoln County and Nye County and Esmeralda County  
 24 will be stuck with nothing because the State will  
 25 disburse the money on a population basis, and all the

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

Page 9

1 money will go to Clark County or Washoe County.  
2 MR. DERKOVITZ: My name is Leslie  
3 Derkovitz. One of my big concerns, I guess, is the  
4 possibility of a breach of a shipping cask, I guess is  
5 a perfect way to put it. And really not through a  
6 rail accident or something to that effect.

7 I really think if anything ever does get  
8 approached, it will be an act of terrorism because  
9 you're going to need a great deal of energy to bust  
10 these things open or a train wreck.

11 So with that in mind, has the government  
12 spent enough time researching the possibilities and  
13 coming up with scenarios that can either prevent that  
14 possibility from happening or minimizing the impact to  
15 any location or maybe surrounding the area where the  
16 act took place?

17 Actually, I suppose here in the rural areas  
18 this final closing route to the test site at Yucca  
19 Mountain is probably minimal. But these things are  
20 probably going to be coming through much more  
21 populated areas. The commercial lines, the rail  
22 lines, that are already in existence that are going to  
23 be used for these casks before they get to the  
24 transfer points or the switching point here to take it  
25 to the final leg.

Page 10

1 But somewhere if an act of terrorism does  
2 happen to open one of these things up, there's going  
3 to be a lot of people impacted and obviously very  
4 dangerously. And to what degree? Has the government  
5 done research to ensure that won't happen and that  
6 there can be maximum protection for people down  
7 winders or whatever else at breach point? That's my  
8 biggest concern.

9 And in the final link, here again, this is  
10 a small potatoes thing. But if the rail is going to  
11 be put through -- we've got only three little  
12 communities here that we're going to be coming close  
13 to. It would be ridiculous, in my opinion, to run the  
14 rail line close to any one of these communities. We  
15 have a lot of no-man's-land in Lincoln County. We can  
16 at least make sure we're as far away from whatever  
17 population we do have here and give us time to run if  
18 they do cut one up.

19 And I really don't think that's going to be  
20 any more exposure than radiation from the sun or  
21 anything else. I don't worry about that. I only  
22 worry about the breach of the cask.

23 MR. SCOVILLE: My name is Curtis Scoville.  
24 We've been here four years. I retired from the Air  
25 Force some time ago. We were looking for a place

Page 11

1 where it was nice and quiet where we could live  
2 quietly the rest of our lives. And that's all I was  
3 thinking of anyway. That was a major decision to  
4 make. We have a nice home here, and we just want to  
5 keep it that way as long as we live. Other than that,  
6 we have no problem at all.

7 And I've been over to Yucca Mountain. So I  
8 know what that looks like. And I talked to the  
9 engineers there. I'm very satisfied that they are  
10 very competent. They know what they're doing. And  
11 I've gotten to know the mayor reasonably well. So I  
12 think he knows what he's doing trying to get the  
13 railroad into Caliente and trying for everything.

14 I have a bachelor's and master's in physics  
15 from Ohio State University. I did my research work in  
16 nuclear physics. So I understand it fairly well. And  
17 then after that in the Air Force, I was assigned as  
18 the chief of the shielding and radiation effects  
19 branch of the nuclear powered airplane in both of the  
20 laboratories that the company was working for, which  
21 was Convoyer and Lockheed.

22 Gee, I don't remember when that was, but  
23 the late '50s, '60s. As I understand it, nothing new  
24 has come out in physics since then. So what I studied  
25 is still current and the research work that we did to

Page 12

1 gather information on -- the research we did was on  
2 certain radioactive isotopes in getting their energy  
3 levels and rate of decay, et cetera. We built all the  
4 equipment for it. Well, I don't mean we built it. We  
5 designed it. And we told the people who built the  
6 equipment what we needed and they did and it worked  
7 great.

8 So we have at least a few bits of  
9 information on the charge of radionuclides. If you've  
10 ever taken a look at that, all of the radioactive  
11 isotopes with their half lives and energy levels of  
12 all emissions that they might make. So I understand  
13 that pretty well.

14 I suppose I've covered everything that I  
15 really need to. I'd just like to be sure that whoever  
16 is going through this knows there are at least a few  
17 people out here that have some knowledge of the  
18 nuclear physics involved. And our only concern is do  
19 I have to evacuate our house in order for the railroad  
20 to go through? And I think the answer to that is no.

21 And a little noise once in a while from a  
22 train going through is not a real problem as far as  
23 I'm concerned. After all the things I've gone through  
24 in my 83 years, nothing else is going to bother me, I  
25 don't think.

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

Page 13

1 So thank you for taking time to put all  
2 this down. And I don't know whether anyone will find  
3 time to sit down and read it or not. But my address  
4 is [REDACTED] I'm a retired  
5 colonel with the United States Air Force. Our only  
6 concern is can we stay in our house. And I think the  
7 answer is, yes, we can. And so a train going through  
8 from time to time isn't going to bother us at all.

9 MRS. SCOVILLE: He can't hear it anyway.  
10 And I can't hear the train now that goes through  
11 Caliente. And that's 8 miles from the house. And  
12 that's at night when it's quiet.

13 MR. HATCH: My name is Rocky Hatch. The  
14 way the proposed rail line goes is it goes right  
15 through the middle of my range out there. So I have a  
16 lot of concern as to how this is going to affect me as  
17 far as my livelihood and cattle. It's going to split  
18 up the range from our waters on both sides. So I'm  
19 going to have to have water on both sides of the  
20 track.

21 I wonder how much area it's going to take.  
22 What kind of roads it's going to take out. Am I going  
23 to be able to work with the BLM as far as if they do  
24 fence it and put fences on both sides, then it will be  
25 like four allotments or two allotments instead of the

Page 15

1 am concerned over the route that this proposed rail  
2 line is taking. I have some questions as to why is it  
3 up and around and not more of a direct route. I  
4 understand the issues with the government. But from  
5 going here and going straight across the test site, it  
6 seems like it will save \$400 million in costs going  
7 straight across the test range, which is already  
8 there, already protected, already has nuclear waste  
9 all over it and bombing radiation, the whole nine  
10 yards. So I don't understand why we couldn't tweak  
11 this line.

12 I also understand the issues in not going  
13 over the U.S. Air Force. But I think it can be looked  
14 at. Some of these lines could be tweaked. I think  
15 the proposed route could be changed. Obviously, I am  
16 very concerned over Garden Valley, what we call the  
17 Michoacan area. I'm concerned over there with the  
18 proposed route. Some of the things I'd like to be  
19 answered is if this route goes through, is one rancher  
20 being affected more so than another rancher? Because  
21 there's something that can be done as far as shared  
22 allotment size.

23 I am also concerned about the BLM and the  
24 DOE and some of the other government entities getting  
25 together and talking about it so that everybody is on

Page 14

1 one.  
2 And so I wonder how they're going to make  
3 me run so many cows on one side or so many on the  
4 other side. That's some of my concerns with the BLM.  
5 I don't know how they are going to do it, how much  
6 room it's going to take, and stuff like that. That's  
7 some of the things I'm just worried about. How I'm  
8 going to handle the cattle and what the BLM is going  
9 to do for me.

10 There's probably another alternative when  
11 you go down lower to Murphy Gap and in through that  
12 country. It's still going to affect some ranchers  
13 anywhere you go. If it went through that alternative,  
14 that wouldn't affect me at all. And then if they go  
15 down through Beaumont, if I could meet with the DOE  
16 and look through it, that would be fine.

17 Like I said, one of the biggest concerns I  
18 have is the construction when they go out there and  
19 start tearing or putting the line in that they're  
20 going to do. If they're going to make me move my cows  
21 off there while they're doing it or if there's going  
22 to be a lot of equipment that's going to chase my cows  
23 around and scare them. Because it doesn't take much  
24 to scare calves. That's one of my biggest concerns.

25 MR. POULSEN: My name is Wade Poulsen. I

Page 16

1 the same page so that one agenda is not different from  
2 another agenda.

3 I think that there can be a compromise  
4 reached with some of the ranchers and the people that  
5 are going to be affected. What those compromises are,  
6 I don't know at this time.

7 Some discussions on what kind of water  
8 improvements can be done on the route, what kind of  
9 changes to the route can be done, and also what kind  
10 of impact is going to be done if the land is going to  
11 be unusable in a mile or a two-mile swath. And it  
12 can be limited to 200 feet. Is that feasible? Would  
13 that work for both DOE, BLM, and the ranchers? Some  
14 of those discussions as being able to compromise and  
15 work together.

16 I think as long as the communication lines  
17 between the DOE and the BLM and the people that are  
18 affected -- as long as that communication stays open  
19 and they listen to the people who use the land, it can  
20 be reached so that this line could go through.

21 But I am afraid sometimes that individuals  
22 who are affected get it rammed down their throat more  
23 so than a compromise being reached and improvements  
24 being done on both sides.

25 Like I said, I'm very concerned over this

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

Page 17

1 because this goes right through some allotment that I  
2 have some interest in. And if there was a way that  
3 this could be tweaked to either one specific range.  
4 The Michoacan Range could be completely disallowed to  
5 come through.

6 Could we come down on the other side of the  
7 Worthington Mountains? Is there a way that it can  
8 come down through that way? Or is it feasible if  
9 coming across on the Seaman Range going up over Lake  
10 Mill Summit and right through the summit side and  
11 coming down the high road and coming across and saving  
12 distance? Those are the types of things I would like  
13 to see some dialogue on.

14 Other things I'm concerned about is such as  
15 the water waste. On the washes will culverts be put  
16 in and will improvements be made to not change the  
17 direction of the run off water which is vital and  
18 important to water getting down into the middle ground  
19 for the cattle to be able to use? Will this be  
20 diverted?

21 These are some questions I would like to  
22 see done as it gets closer and we get more engineering  
23 data back as to how they are going to build this  
24 railway. What kind of distance is going to be done as  
25 far as that waterway is concerned? Will a wash be

Page 19

1 railroad, 319 miles, no jeeps, no helicopters, and  
2 acquaint themselves with this catastrophe. That's my  
3 fantasy, the last one.

4 MR. PHILLIPS: I'm Kevin Phillips. I'm the  
5 mayor of the City of Caliente. I've studied this  
6 issue for 11 years. I've been a constructive  
7 proactive person on this thing for a long time. I'd  
8 like to put my nod in favor of a multiuse railroad.  
9 That's very important to us so we can ship general  
10 freight back and forth.

11 I'd like to remind the Department of the  
12 Nuclear Waste Policy Act, which the United States  
13 Congress identified 14 potential areas of impact clear  
14 back in 1982. They are listed in Section 175 of the  
15 Act. Those issues need to be addressed as this goes  
16 forward.

17 Also noted in the Act that those states and  
18 local governments, particularly that accrue the most  
19 severe impact, that those impacts are compensated.  
20 The way you handle impacts is you either avoid them or  
21 compensate them or change some things to where they're  
22 lessened.

23 Of course, the impacts can be positive and  
24 negative. Positive impacts are economic growth, job  
25 opportunity, and those kinds of things. We hope that

Page 18

1 eliminated or will it be gone over or will it divert  
2 the water?

3 So there are some questions there I don't  
4 have the answers or that I would like to have some  
5 discussion on.

6 MS. RAY: My name is Dorothy M. Ray of  
7 Caliente, Nevada.

8 Why as the most populated area of Lincoln  
9 County are we being targeted for transportation of  
10 nuclear waste?

11 State's rights should permit residents to  
12 make this decision, not elected officials who have  
13 begged and cajoled the federal government to give this  
14 to us.

15 The impact of this railroad will be  
16 disastrous and devastating to every resident of this  
17 county. The ranchers and those living in the outside  
18 areas will face financial ruin.

19 The County Commission always talks of  
20 needing every taxpayer. Where is the mayor going to  
21 put 100-plus people, wives, and children in our small  
22 town?

23 Lastly, I want to see the head of the DOE,  
24 Kevin Phillips, and all the County Commissioners put  
25 on their boots and jeans and walk every mile of this

Page 20

1 those are maximized to the hilt. It's quite likely  
2 that the City of Caliente will be near the terminus  
3 branching of this railroad.

4 And so improvements to emergency response,  
5 hospital, education, law enforcement, cultured  
6 recreational needs. Because of an influx of workers,  
7 improvements to roads, service facilities, et cetera.  
8 All the impacts identified by the Congress will need  
9 to be included in here.

10 The thing I think that the Department needs  
11 to understand -- and I've voiced this to the  
12 Department -- is that the minute -- let me back up a  
13 little bit.

14 There are impacts immediate, short-term,  
15 and long-term. And they're from small to large. The  
16 immediate is as soon as the Department withdrew this  
17 land, there were impacts that accrued to our people.  
18 I have a number of friends who cannot proceed with  
19 projects that they were working on. Some on private  
20 ground and some on the public ground because of the  
21 unknown factor where this rail alignment is going to  
22 be. And those impacts need to be taken into  
23 consideration. And they need to be addressed and as  
24 promptly as possible. So time is a serious factor  
25 here.

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p> <p>1 The decisions need to be made relevant to  2 rail alignment so that we can take the unknown away  3 from some of our people and then in a serious fashion  4 begin to mitigate and compensate and do what's  5 necessary to lessen the impact to those that are going  6 to be impacted period.  7 That's probably really all I wanted to  8 say. I've been one that supported the choosing of the  9 Caliente Corridor. I support that choice. I've  10 always felt it would give us economic development  11 opportunity.  12 Most of the corridor was actually  13 pioneered, or designed if you will, in the '80s. The  14 County had an engineering firm, Deleaux and Cather.  15 The engineer proposed the most conceivable route in  16 the county. It's doable. And this is the way the  17 existing corridor is going.  18 So as a boy raised here, we had a lot of  19 railroad activity. We had a railroad going all the  20 way to Pioche and the Castleton Mines. We had all the  21 mines operating in my lifetime. I've lived here my  22 entire life except for going away to college. I'm a  23 fourth generation native, a Lincoln County guy.  24 I've seen the mines go away. I've seen the  25 railroad go away. I've seen job opportunity go away.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 of the impacts of Southern Nevada as far as mining and  2 ranching.  3 And if you have designated trains, it makes  4 it easier for terrorists to pick out a shipment. So  5 they know when it's coming and they know what it is if  6 that's the only thing on that particular corridor. So  7 multiuse is very beneficial. I'm not in favor of the  8 dedicated train because of the possibility of  9 terrorist attack. And the other uses, like I said, is  10 for the ranching and mining possibilities in Nye  11 County, and Lincoln County area would have potential  12 for it.  13 It also will make it easier for Union  14 Pacific to change one of the main routes because the  15 canyon floods out a clear bit and they've had a number  16 of derailments especially on the southbound -- or the  17 westbound trains as they call them. If they can run  18 around by knocking them back into Caliente, then that  19 would alleviate some of that congestion in that canyon  20 and be able to help them as well.  21 So that's why I say there's multiuses for  22 that, and I think that's something they need to  23 consider very seriously.  24 MS. RUSSELL: My name is Elizabeth Dewey  25 Russell. I was born in Caliente. I'm a fourth</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 And we're a railroad people. We know how to maintain  2 railroads. We know how to build them. Our fathers  3 and mothers used to work on them.  4 The things that brought people to Lincoln  5 County originally in the start of the century are  6 mines and railroad. Some of those that have come in  7 the recent past have a right to their opinion, but  8 they certainly don't know the history. When they say  9 they don't want to see a train going, we used to have  10 11 tracks in the siting here in Caliente. So I like  11 hearing the whistles.  12 I want opportunities for my children and  13 their children to have vocational training and be  14 prepared to take on these jobs. Once again, if the  15 City of Caliente and Lincoln County is going to bear a  16 significant level of this national burden, the jobs  17 come here. The economical development opportunities  18 come here. That's what's fair. That's all I have to  19 say.  20 MR. WALLIS: My name is Stan Wallis. I'm a  21 resident of Caliente. I'm on the JCAC Board County  22 Impact Alleviation Committee, and we're in support of  23 the Caliente route. I believe that the rail route  24 ought to be multiuse and not singular use dedicated  25 for two reasons. One is it will help alleviate some</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 generation Nevadan. My great-grandfather came to  2 Nevada in 1862. He prospected for gold and found a  3 gold mine and sold it and used the proceeds to buy a  4 ranch, which is 21 miles down the canyon in Elgin.  5 It's formerly called the Bradshaw Ranch.  6 In addition to that, my great-grandmother  7 was born in the area, and her mother was born in the  8 area. So family-wise I've been in this area for a  9 long time.  10 I feel this is inevitable, but I really am  11 opposed because I feel the federal government could  12 better spend their money by securing the sites where  13 that nuclear waste is being stored right now.  14 I'm looking at the rail corridors and  15 hearing other people. I don't think the Department of  16 Energy has really thought out very well or checked  17 with local people to find out mixed routes or how to  18 bring waste across. They're making a difficult job  19 more difficult.  20 I don't question the fact that Yucca is  21 probably a very secure place to store nuclear waste.  22 I also don't question the fact that I think the  23 containers are probably very secure. But thanks to  24 our President, in today's climate where we have a lot  25 of people who are very angry at the United States and</p>

Page 25

1 who are trying to find ways to attack us, I think the  
2 rail corridors are very fragile in terms of there are  
3 so many places that someone could hide a shoulder-held  
4 rocket launcher, attack a train, and disappear into  
5 nowhere. The country is too open to really secure the  
6 travel of the material from one site to another, and I  
7 think it's almost an impossible task to secure the  
8 shipments from their origin to Yucca Mountain.

9 I know that most of the power plants are in  
10 urban areas, and I think the government would better  
11 spend their money by securing those areas because they  
12 could make a big enough area around that section to  
13 guard against shoulder-held rocket launchers and catch  
14 people. I think it would be easier for them to do  
15 that there than here basically. And that's it.

16 MS. HORNBECK: I'm Ronda Hornbeck. I'm a  
17 Lincoln County Commissioner.

18 One of the things I would like to make sure  
19 is that as these railroads are taken forward, that the  
20 County, number one, is a cooperating agent in a lot of  
21 the determinations.

22 I would also like to request that BLM and  
23 DOE get together and make an overlay on their maps  
24 that actually show the allotments that are out there  
25 and make sure that we know who the allotments belong

Page 27

1 of Caliente and Lincoln County.

2 My first comment regards the development of  
3 the no-action alternative for the environment impact  
4 statement to be prepared on the Caliente Rail  
5 Corridor. We believe that the no-action alternative  
6 must comprise at least two alternatives. And by the  
7 time we file written comments, we may further refine  
8 this and add another option.

9 But at this point we believe that one of  
10 the -- the only true no-action alternative would be  
11 the mostly truck transportation scenario, which is  
12 described in the final environmental impact statement  
13 for the Yucca Mountain Repository.

14 A second no-action alternative would be a  
15 legal-weight truck rail intermodal transportation  
16 scenario such as was described in the supplemental  
17 analysis released by the Department of Energy on  
18 March 10 of 2004.

19 Point Number 2: In evaluating the  
20 legal-weight truck rail intermodal scenario in the  
21 draft EIS, we recommend the following preliminary  
22 comments. And, of course, as I said, we'll be  
23 refining them and submitting additional written  
24 comments.

25 But comment Number 1 is that DOE must

Page 26

1 to and any private properties that are out there so  
2 that the private property owners know just exactly  
3 where the rail line will go. And if the rail line  
4 could be posted out around their property, and if they  
5 can't, then what the mitigations are going to be on  
6 that. I'm sure you've gotten that a million times  
7 already at least.

8 MR. HALSTEAD: My name is Robert Halstead.  
9 I'm Transportation Adviser for the State of Nevada  
10 Agency for Nuclear Projects. I work on a consultant  
11 basis. So my home office is [REDACTED]

12 [REDACTED] My telephone number is  
13 [REDACTED] My e-mail address is  
14 [REDACTED]

15 The comments that I'm making tonight are a  
16 continuation of comments that I made at the scoping  
17 meetings in Amargosa Valley and in Goldfield. And  
18 these comments are only a preliminary version of  
19 comments that the State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear  
20 Projects will be filing a written form in compliance  
21 with the June 1st deadline, unless hopefully it's  
22 extended again.

23 My comments tonight reflect several aspects  
24 of the proposed railroad which are of particular  
25 interest both to the State of Nevada and to the City

Page 28

1 evaluate the legal-weight truck rail intermodal  
2 scenario both as an actual no-action alternative in  
3 which it would occur for either 24 years or 38 years,  
4 depending on whether the Department seeks or is given  
5 authority to dispose of more than 70,000 MTU.

6 And at the same time, the EIS must consider  
7 the legal-weight truck rail intermodal scenario as a  
8 six-year contingency plan as it has been described by  
9 the Department of Energy as a way of allowing the  
10 Department to receive fuel at a Yucca Mountain  
11 facility at a date before the completion of a new rail  
12 line.

13 We believe that in carrying out this  
14 analysis, the Department must evaluate legal-weight  
15 truck rail intermodal not only for all of the sites  
16 and routes identified in the repository EIS for  
17 heavy-haul truck intermodal, but it must also consider  
18 additional sites in Central Nevada, Southern Nevada,  
19 and in adjacent areas of California and Utah.

20 Further, we believe that the draft EIS must  
21 not only look at the Nevada impacts of a legal-weight  
22 truck rail intermodal system, but it must also look at  
23 the national impacts of both a six-year and a 24-year  
24 legal-weight truck rail intermodal system.

25 And it must specifically at the national

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>1 level look at the implications for the 72 commercial  2 shipping sites and the five Department of Energy  3 shipping sites.  4 And, secondly, it must consider the impacts  5 on the corridor states and the states where rail  6 interchange facilities would occur. Cities such as  7 Cleveland, Chicago, Atlanta, Nashville, St. Louis,  8 Kansas City, Salt Lake, Amarillo, and San Bernardino,  9 which are the places where the trains carrying the  10 legal-weight trucks would -- where the trains would be  11 consolidated or where interchanges between different  12 rail carriers would occur.  13 Finally, regarding the legal-weight truck  14 rail intermodal, it's very important that DOE do a  15 thorough cost analysis.  16 And the cost analysis must, first of all,  17 allow a stand-alone comparison between mostly truck  18 and mostly rail with a rail spur and a legal-weight  19 truck rail intermodal both as a substitute for the  20 construction of the rail spur and also as a six-year  21 contingency plan to accommodate delays in the  22 completion of construction of the rail spur.  23 And the cost analysis must also reflect in  24 detail the costs of the hardware investments and casks  25 because a major cost discriminator between shipping by</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>1 into the Powder River Basin and later the Joyce Line  2 and other construction experience within the last 20  3 years.  4 Comment Number 4. The draft EIS must  5 present an accurate and scenario-sensitive assessment  6 of the potential employment impacts of the  7 construction and operation of the rail line and also a  8 comparative analysis of the employment impacts of the  9 legal-weight truck rail intermodal 24-year and  10 six-year scenarios as compared also to the true  11 no-action alternative, which is the mostly truck  12 scenario identified in the Yucca Mountain Repository  13 EIS. In particular, a pounding scenario approach  14 which estimates high, low, and most-likely employment  15 impacts is necessary.  16 Further, the discussion of local employment  17 impacts must reflect the employment impacts of the  18 construction approach that DOE appears to be  19 advocating, which is to segment the route into four,  20 six, or eight segments that would be constructed  21 concurrently.  22 The employment impacts of that approach  23 must be compared with a strategy designed to increase  24 local employment benefits, which would involve  25 breaking the line into two segments with construction</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>1 rail and shipping by truck has to do with the number  2 of casks that are required, the costs that are  3 associated with the casks, and the turnaround time  4 which determines the capacity utilization of the  5 casks. And all of these are important drivers of cost  6 and must be addressed in the draft of the  7 environmental impact statement.  8 My third comment regards the overall cost  9 estimates for construction of the Caliente Rail  10 Corridor. And I'll make this a short comment as we  11 will elaborate upon it in the future.  12 The cost estimates must not only reflect a  13 detailed analysis of the requirements along the  14 specific alignment that is chosen within the Caliente  15 Corridor, but it also must reflect uncertainty costs  16 based upon route specific considerations, which might  17 be alignment changes due to the discovery of  18 previously unknown archaeological sites or  19 environmental resources which require major rerouting.  20 And the cost uncertainty analysis must also  21 reflect the historical experience with the railroad  22 construction in the United States. And, in  23 particular, it must consider the experience with  24 comparably sized projects, such as the Orin Line  25 constructed into the Powder River Basin or in route</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>1 to begin concurrently from Caliente and Yucca  2 Mountain, meeting at some to-be-determined common  3 point along the route. In other words, it must  4 compare a two-segment construction scenario with a  5 multiple-segment construction scenario.  6 They must further identify whether they are  7 willing to guarantee that some percentage of the jobs  8 created by the Project will actually be given to local  9 residents. And they must also for the range of  10 construction scenarios considered identify not only an  11 aggregate number of jobs, but a disaggregate analysis  12 that shows number of jobs and type of employment by  13 particular employment area.  14 And, of course, we will be submitting much  15 more detailed comments on all four of these areas as  16 part of our written comments on the Project. And  17 thank you for your patience at the late hour.  18 (Thereupon, the proceedings  19 were adjourned.)  20  21  22  23  24  25</p>



REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF NEVADA )

) ss

COUNTY OF CLARK )

I, Jane V. Michaels, Certified Shorthand  
Reporter, do hereby certify that I took down in  
Stenotype all of the proceedings had in the  
before-entitled matter at the time and place indicated  
and that thereafter said shorthand notes were  
transcribed into typewriting at and under my direction  
and supervision and that the foregoing transcript  
constitutes a full, true and accurate record of the  
proceedings had.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my  
hand and affixed my official seal of office in the  
County of Clark, State of Nevada, this 7th day  
of May, 2004.

Jane V. Michaels, RPR  
NV CCR No. 601  
CA CSR No. 10660